



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/521,235	03/08/2000	KISHORE S SWAMINATHAN	AND1P535	1907

28164 7590 04/05/2006  
ACCENTURE CHICAGO 28164  
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P O BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

e

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/521,235	SWAMINATHAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Maikhanh Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9,11,13,15 and 17-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9,11,13,15 and 17-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 01/20/2006 to the original application filed 03/08/2000.
2. Claims 1-9, 11, 13, 15, and 17-28 are currently pending in this application. Claims 11 and 17-18 have been amended. Claims 10, 12, 14, and 16 have been canceled. Claims 1, 7 and 13 are independent claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.*

*(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).*

4. Claims 1-9, 11, 13, 15, and 17-19, and 21-27 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bezos et al.** (U.S. 6,029,141, issued 02/2000).

**As to claims 1, 7, and 13:**

- a. Bezos teaches a computer-implemented method for developing a dossier for a proposal (*see Abstract*) comprising the steps of:
- receiving into the computer a name of a client relevant to the proposal (*e.g., an online registration process for allowing other entities 'individuals, companies, etc.' to register as associates ... creates an entry in the associate database according to the information provided by the enrolling associate; col.6, lines 21-30 / a customer access an associate's Web site; col.11, lines 30-43*);
  - presenting on a computer-user interface (*e.g., to be displayed on the customer computer 108*) associated with the client a list (*e.g., merchant Web site 106*) consisting of industries (*e.g., business entities/associates or respective business partners who marketing products and selling products on the merchant Web site*) [*see the Abstract and the merchant's Web site discussion, beginning at col.1, line 50*].
  - allowing selection of an industry from the list of industries (*e.g., allows the customer to select products from multiple different Web sites; see Abstract and col.2, line 66-col.3, line 2*).
  - searching in a plurality of computer-readable knowledge repositories for information relating to the client and the selected industry (*e.g., allow potential customers to link to the merchant's Web site to initiate purchases of*

*such products from the merchant) [see the merchant's Web site discussion, beginning at col.1, line 62].*

- *allowing selection of information for display in the dossier (e.g., when the customer clicks on this hyperlink 808, the merchant Web server 132 returns a dynamic-generated HTML document that displays the contents of the shopping cart ...displays information about the products currently selected by the customer; col.15, lines 10-27); and*
  - *preparing the dossier utilizing the information found during the searching, wherein the dossier comprises information relevant to the selected industry, the client and the proposal, and further comprises information concerning experienced people, prior documents, and past project pertaining to the proposal (e.g., fig.10b is illustrated as a dossier that collects relevance data for user. If a user selects an author name, the search result will be a dossier including information about this author, all documents or projects about this author).*
- b. Bezos does not specifically teach *"allowing verification that the information displayed is correct, and if not correct, allowing correction of the displayed information."*
- c. However, the claim feature is suggested by Bezos in fig.10c. Fig.10c shows a shopping card Web page displaying the products selected by the customer. The Web page allows the customer to double check the products he/she selected. The

Art Unit: 2176

customer can delete an item that he/she does not want to purchase and/or the customer can change the quantity of the product(s) that he/she wants to purchase.

- d. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Bezos's teachings for "*allowing verification that the information displayed is correct, and if not correct, allowing correction of the displayed information*" because it would have allowed the customer to add/delete items showing on the shopping card Web page before making a payment for the selected products.

**As to claims 2 & 8:**

Bezos teaches presenting an alternate list consisting of industries not associated with the client (*col.1, lines 62-66*).

**As to claim 3:**

Bezos teaches information is selected for display in the dossier by checking check-boxes for at least one of people, documents, and projects (*col.16, lines 10-41*).

**As to claim 4:**

Bezos teaches the dossier information is corrected by returning to at least one previous step in the method and re-selecting the information (*col. 12, lines 14-51 & see fig.10C and the associated text*).

**As to claim 5:**

Bezos teaches the people section is arranged according to the number of documents and projects an individual has produced related to the client or industry (*col.9, lines 9-29*).

**As to claim 6:**

Bezos teaches the documents and projects sections are arranged chronologically (*col.16, lines 10-41*).

**As to claims 9 & 15:**

Bezos teaches displays topics associated with the client (*col.6, line 21-col.7, line5*) and allows selection of at least one of the topics for insertion of information relating to the selected at least one of the topics in the dossier (*see figs. 8-9 and the associated text*).

**As to claim 11 & 17:**

The information concerning people is arranged according to the number of documents and projects as individual has produced related to the client or industry (*col.16, lines 11-41*).

**As to claim 18:**

The information concerning documents is arranged chronologically and the information concerning projects is arranged chronologically (*col.16, lines 11-41*).

**As to claim 19:**

Bezos teaches searching for information relating to the at least one of the selected topics, and displaying the information related to the at least one of the selected topics (*col.9, lines 9-36*).

**As to claims 21 & 23:**

Bezos teaches the list of associated industries is presented in response to receiving the name of the client (*e.g., business entities/associates*) [*see the Abstract and the merchant's Web site discussion, beginning at col.1, line 50*].

**As to claims 22 & 24:**

Bezos teaches storing the association of one or more industries with the name of the client (*see Abstract & col.2, lines 18-65*).

**As to claim 25:**

Bezos teaches displaying a list of clients matching the received client name and allowing selection of a client from the list (*see the select products from multiple different sites discussion beginning at col.2, line 66*).

**As to claim 26:**

Bezos teaches allowing selection of information for display in the proposal dossier (*e.g., when the customer clicks on this hyperlink 808, the merchant Web server 132 returns a dynamic-generated HTML document that displays the contents of the shopping cart ...displays information about the products currently selected by the customer; col.15, lines 10-27*).

**As to claim 27:**

Bezos teaches the items selected for display are the most relevant items, based on a weight schema that takes into account relevant with respect to at least one of the client, the selected industry, and a topic (*col.15, line 27-60*).

5. Claims 20 and 28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bezos et al.** in view of **Mielenhausen** (U.S. 6,529,911– filed 05/1998).



**As to claim 20:**

- a. Bezos does not specifically teach “*arranged sections include displayed expanded node and subnodes.*”
- b. Mielenhausen teaches arranged sections include displayed expanded node and subnodes (*see fig.25*).
- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature from Mielenhausen in the system of Bezos because it would have allowed for defining structural and functional relationships between separate data structures for research projects.

**As to claim 28:**

- a. Bezos does not specifically teach “*the dossier is presented in expandable nodes and subnodes according to categories of people, documents, and projects.*”
- b. Mielenhausen teaches the dossier is presented in expandable nodes and subnodes according to categories of people, documents, and projects (*see figs.22-23 and 25*).
- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature from Mielenhausen in the system of Bezos because it would have allowed for defining structural and functional relationships between separate data structures for research projects.

*Response to Arguments*

6. Applicant's arguments filed 01/20/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. Applicant argues that Bezos does not teach "presenting on a computer-user interface a list consisting of industries associated with the client" [Remarks, page 8, 1st full paragraph].

In response, Bezos teaches presenting on a computer-user interface (e.g., to be displayed on the customer computer 108) associated with the client a list (e.g., merchant Web site 106) consisting of industries (e.g., business entities/associates or respective business partners who marketing products and selling products on the merchant Web site) [see the Abstract and the merchant's Web site discussion, beginning at col.1, line 50].

b. Applicant argues that Bezos does not teach "allowing selection of an industry from the list of industries" [Remarks, page 8, 2nd paragraph].

In response, Bezos teaches allowing selection of an industry from the list of industries (e.g., the merchant site is also implements an electronic shopping cart that allows the customer to select products from multiple different Web sites, and then perform a single "check out" from the merchant's page; see Abstract and col.2, line 66-col.3, line 2).

- c. Applicant argues that Bezos does not teach the step of searching for information relating to the client or to a selected industry [Remarks, page 8, last paragraph].

In response, Bezos teaches searching for information relating to the client, or to the selected industry (e.g., allow potential customers to link to the merchant's Web site to initiate purchases of such products from the merchant) [see the merchant's Web site discussion, beginning at col.1, line 62].

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Karaev et al.	U.S. Pat. No. 5,802,518	issued: Sep. 1, 1998
Zucknovich et al.	U.S. Pat. No. 5,940,843	issued: Aug. 17, 1999
Dempski et al.	U.S. Pat. No. 6,727,927	issued: Apr. 27, 2004
Liongosari et al.	U.S. Pat. No. 6,900,807	issued: May. 31, 2005

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

*Contact information*

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached at (571) 272-4136.
- The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN

  
HEATHER R. HERNDON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100